DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 532 RC 009 131

AUTHOR Schmitt, Raymond
TITLE Manpower Training and Employment Programs Serving Rural America. Report on Request of the Subcommittee on Rural Development of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by the Library of Congress, Congressional Research Services. Committee Print, 93d Congress, 1st Session, October 31, 1973.
INSTITUTION Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Congressional Research Service.
SPONS AGENCY Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.
PUB DATE 31 Oct 73
NOTE 15p.; Not available in hard copy due to print size of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Enrollment Rate; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Evaluation; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Job Training; *Manpower Development; Program Descriptions; Revenue Sharing; *Rural Population; *Statistical Data; Synthesis

ABSTRACT

Based upon numerous government reports and evaluation studies, this report presents: (1) a brief sketch of the Federal involvement in manpower training and employment programs; (2) some impressions of the manpower training and employment programs serving rural Americans; (3) statistical information on the estimated number of rural enrollees, funds obligated, and key characteristics of individuals enrolled in selected manpower programs; (4) a brief description of the manpower programs serving rural Americans; and (5) a bibliography of reports and evaluation studies concerning manpower programs operational in rural areas. Among the major "impressions" recorded in this document are: (1) the impact of mechanization and agribusiness upon rural employment has been profound; (2) better labor market information is needed to foster rural economic development; (3) most major manpower training and employment programs appear to be designed primarily for urban residents; (4) manpower training programs appear to face limited chances for success in rural areas due to limited job opportunities and economic growth; (5) use of Federal programs which create jobs (e.g., Operation Mainstream) offer temporary alleviation of rural unemployment and appear to be effective in the short run; (6) manpower revenue sharing may not work to the advantage of rural areas, as they may be unable to compete for funds. (JC)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED121532

93d Congress
1st Session } COMMITTEE PRINT

MANPOWER TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS SERVING RURAL AMERICA

REPORT ON REQUEST OF THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

BY

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
RAYMOND SCHMITT
Education and Public Welfare Division

OCTOBER 31, 1973

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1973

RECEIVED
DEC 22 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

R0091/31

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
GEORGE McGOVERN, South Dakota
JAMES B. ALLEN, Alabama
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, Kentucky
DICK CLARK, Iowa
CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska
GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma
JESSE HELMS, North Carolina

HARRY T. STANTON, *General Counsel and Staff Director*
MICHAEL R. McLEOD, *Counsel*
HENRY J. CARSO, *Economist*
FORIST W. REECE, *Professional Staff Member*
JAMES W. GILTMIER, *Press Secretary*
JAMES E. THORNTON, *Professional Staff Member*
WILLIAM A. TAGGART, *Professional Staff Member*
THOMAS R. SAYLOR, *Professional Staff Member*
COTYS M. MOUSER, *Chief Clerk*
JAMES M. KENDALL, *Clerk for the Minority*
BETTY M. MASON, *Clerical Assistant*
HELEN A. MILLER, *Clerical Assistant*
LOUELLA C. McENROE, *Clerical Assistant*
JANET L. MOORE, *Clerical Assistant*
DIXIE LEE TALLEY, *Clerical Assistant*
NANCY C. BENSON, *Clerical Assistant*
REGGIE J. WHITE, *Clerical Assistant*
LYNN F. CONROY, *Clerical Assistant*
CINDY ANTHONY, *Clerical Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

DICK CLARK, Iowa, *Chairman*

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi
JAMES B. ALLEN, Alabama
CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas
HENRY BELLMON, Oklahoma

Ex-Officio Member

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia

FOREWORD

Over the past several years there has been a considerable proliferation of manpower and employment programs funded by the Federal Government designed to put people and jobs together.

While the factors motivating the initiation of these programs have generally seemed worthwhile the Rural Development Subcommittee has been receiving reports from rural people that the benefits of these programs are not being delivered to the people of the countryside, where half the nation's citizens who live in poverty reside.

Therefore, the Subcommittee asked Mr. Raymond Schmitt of the Congressional Research Service to prepare a survey of the national manpower effort including some indication of whether these conclusions on whether these impressions were correct or misfounded.

The report speaks for itself.

DICK CLARK,
Chairman, Rural Development Subcommittee.

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	III
Introduction	1
Federal involvement in manpower training and employment programs	2
Impressions of manpower training and employment programs serving rural Americans	4
Estimated rural enrollment and funds obligated in selected manpower programs	6
Brief description of Department of Labor manpower training and employment programs serving rural America	13
MDTA on-the-job and institutional training	13
Public employment program (PEP)	13
Neighborhood Youth Corps program (NYC)	14
JOBS program	14
Work Incentive (WIN) program	14
Concentrated employment program (CEP)	15
Job Corps	15
Job Bank program	15
Operation Mainstream	16
Area concept expansion (ACE)	16
National migrant worker programs	16
Operation Hitchhike	17
Concerted services in training and education (CSTE)	17
Co-Op support program	18
Farm foreman training	18
Smaller communities program	18
Woods program	19
Indian program	19
Agribusiness occupational identification program	19
Selected bibliography	20

p. iv blank

INTRODUCTION

MANPOWER TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS SERVING RURAL AMERICA

[By Raymond Schmitt, Library of Congress Congressional Research Service]

The first section of this paper sketches Federal involvement in manpower training and employment programs. The second section contains some impressions of manpower training and employment programs serving rural Americans based upon the literature cited in the bibliography. The third section contains statistical information on the estimated number of rural enrollees, funds obligated, and key characteristics of individuals enrolled in selected manpower programs. The fourth section contains a brief description of the manpower programs serving rural Americans. Lastly, a bibliography of reports and evaluation studies concerning manpower programs operational in rural areas is included.

Federal Role in Manpower Training and Employment Programs

Federal involvement in manpower training and employment programs goes back about 40 years. During the period 1933 to 1941, several programs designed to provide work for the unemployed were implemented, particularly under the auspices of the Work Progress (later Work Projects) Administration and the Public Works Administration.

Manpower training as a distinct program area, however, came into being during the 1960s and received its initial recognition in the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961. This act provided job-related training programs for unemployed and underemployed persons. The training programs were somewhat limited because a relatively small amount of money was appropriated for them, and because the act restricted training to persons who resided in areas designated as redevelopment areas. Redevelopment areas were established on the basis of substantial and persistent unemployment, or the low income of the area residents.

In 1962, amendments to the Social Security Act included authorization for the Community Work and Training Program and for demonstration projects in conjunction with federally assisted programs. The Community Work and Training Program made possible significant involvement of State public welfare departments in improving the employability of persons receiving welfare assistance.

The Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) was also enacted in 1962. This was really the first major legislation authorizing manpower training programs. It was felt that the high level of unemployment being experienced at that time was due largely to obsolete skills caused by rapidly advancing technology. The general philosophy underlying the MDTA was that if an individual could be helped to obtain training or retraining, he would then be in a better position to find a job and become self-supporting. Beginning with Fiscal Year 1963, Federal funds were therefore provided to support institutional (classroom) and on-the-job training projects.

The initial experience with the manpower training programs called attention to groups in the population not originally designated for special help—the poorly educated, members of minority groups, men and women with low incomes—who faced major hurdles in obtaining decently paid jobs which would enable them to support themselves and their dependents. The MDTA was therefore subsequently amended in attempts to make it a more flexible instrument for meeting the diverse needs of disadvantaged groups.

The second major enabling legislation for manpower programs was enacted two years after the passage of MDTA. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (EOA) created a range of programs for individuals living in poverty. In the manpower field, the initial three programs of considerable significance resulting from the new legislation were the

Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC), and the Work Experience and Training Program. The latter program was, in effect, a strengthening of the Community Work and Training Program in both scope and resources.

The next major manpower bill was enacted in January 1968, as an amendment to the Social Security Act. It authorized the Work Incentive (WIN) Program to provide "employability development" services for selected welfare recipients in the aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) category. The WIN program is the successor to the Work Experience and Training Program—which was discontinued. It focused responsibility on the Department of Labor and State manpower agencies for the training of the welfare recipients.

In July 1971, as a result of high levels of unemployment, the President signed the two-year Emergency Employment Act which provided $2.25 billion for the creation of public service jobs. Lastly, the WIN amendments of 1971 strengthened the program by emphasizing on-the-job training and other job-related training. It also unified the administration of the program by welfare and labor agencies, while also raising the Federal matching for essential services, and creating incentives at the State level for increasing referrals from the welfare rolls.

39-606—72——3

Impressions of Manpower Training and Employment Programs Serving Rural Americans

The following impressions emerge from reading the sources cited in the attached bibliography. No specific citations are offered because the "impressions" are, in fact, common themes running throughout the literature.

—Mechanization and agribusiness have had a profound impact on the rural way of life. Advances in technology and changes in the structure of agriculture have led to rapidly shrinking employment opportunities, impelling millions of farm laborers and small farmers to seek nonfarm jobs.

—To help foster the economic development of rural America, better labor market information is needed. Companies planning to relocate in rural areas need pertinent information on the make-up of the labor force, the quantity and quality of available and potential labor, as well as physical characteristics and resources available in a given area such as railways, highways, waterways, and relationship to metropolitan areas.

—Most major manpower training and employment programs appear to be designed primarily with urban residents in mind. The JOBS program, for instance, was designed to concentrate its resources on the inner city. While it is now a nationwide program, its effectiveness and applicability in rural areas is questioned by many sources. Furthermore, it is much more difficult for manpower programs to serve rural areas when the population to be served is small and dispersed over a large area.

—Manpower training programs appear to face limited chances for success in rural areas where job opportunities are limited and where there is often a general lack of economic growth. Training individuals for jobs which do not exist locally can cause frustration on the part of the individual while at the same time being a questionable application of Federal funds. Yet, institutional (classroom) training is sometimes given without adequate assurance of post-training job placement. Moreover, persons completing institutional training are sometimes faced with moving to urban areas to obtain employment, thus depleting rural areas of one of their most important resources—manpower.

—The use of Federal programs which create jobs, such as the Operation Mainstream and Public Employment Program, offer *temporary* alleviation of rural unemployment and appear to be the most effective programs for this purpose in the short run. In addition, the enrollees' perception of both these programs and the impact on the community was found to be favorable. Furthermore, jobs created under the Public Employment Program appear to be real rather than "make-work" jobs.

—The Department of Labor's Rural Manpower Service is experimenting with several manpower programs and services specifically designed for rural Americans—for instance the ACE program, Concerted Services in Training and Education, and the Smaller Communities Program. Although these programs are of modest size in comparison to the better known national manpower programs, they appear to somewhat compensate for their lack of size and funding by way of innovation and coordination. Unfortunately, relatively little is known on their overall impact and effectiveness.

—Although the Senate has passed the Job Training and Community Services Act of 1973 which provides the legislative framework for manpower revenue sharing, it is uncertain how effectively rural areas will be able to compete for the funds that will be made available. Much of the allocation of current manpower programs in favor of urban areas is said to be due to the sheer inability of certain rural areas lacking trained and experienced personnel to submit organized plans and projects which qualify for Federal assistance. Moreover, there is sometimes a complete lack of knowledge on the part of some local rural government officials as to what assistance available. These problems could be further complicated under manpower revenue sharing.

Estimated Rural Enrollment and Funds Obligated in Selected Manpower Programs

The table below shows enrollment opportunities, first-time enrollments, and Federal obligations, during Fiscal Year 1972, for work and training programs administered by the Department of Labor. This is followed by a table which shows the estimated rural enrollment and funds obligated in those manpower programs for which the Department of Labor could determine the place of residence of the enrollees. As noted in footnote 1, the second table does not include several manpower programs including the Public Employment Program (PEP) authorized under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. (Nationwide obligations for this program in Fiscal Year 1972 totaled $961,879,000.)

(8)

ENROLLMENT OPPORTUNITIES, FIRST-TIME ENROLLMENTS, AND FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS FOR WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, BY PROGRAM, FISCAL YEARS 1963-72

[Thousands]

Program	Total	Fiscal year—									
		1972	1971	1970	1969	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964	1963
ENROLLMENT OPPORTUNITIES											
Total	7,778.2	1,592.3	1,149.6	1,011.3	998.7	823.6	668.5	693.6	648.2	125.6	58.2
Manpower Development and Training Act	2,691.3	329.2	213.7	211.2	198.5	229.9	276.9	291.1	231.8	125.6	58.2
Institutional training[1]	1,948.1	138.7	144.3	147.2	139.7	141.1	135.4	163.0	107.1	112.5	55.9
JOP-OJT[2]	743.2	90.5	69.2	64.0	77.6	88.4	141.5	128.1	64.7	13.2	2.3
Neighborhood Youth Corps	4,988.2	863.9	698.9	698.9	538.7	537.7	511.6	527.7	278.4		
In school	943.1	101.6	78.9	97.1	103.6	135.9	139.9	188.8	102.3		
Out of school	402.4	51.5	46.1	45.4	31.9	53.6	79.5	96.6	61.7		
Summer	[3]3,132.7	[4]710.9	[4]992.9	[4]457.5	[4]357.2	[4]330.1	294.3	242.3	114.5		
Operation Mainstream	96.9	22.3	23.2	17.6	13.5	16.9	6.9				
Public service careers[5]	111.2	21.9	42.4	24.8	5.9	2.7	4.4				
Special impact[6]	6.9				1.3	1.2	4.9				
Concentrated employment program[7]											
JOBS (federally financed)											
Work incentive program	391.6	69.6	66.6	66.1	54.9	34.5	6.4				
Job Corps	309.9	149.5	69.7	69.7	69.9	5.9					
Public employment program	69.1	24.9	22.4	21.7							
	192.7	192.7									

See footnotes at end of table.

ENROLLMENT OPPORTUNITIES, FIRST-TIME ENROLLMENTS, AND FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS FOR WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, BY PROGRAM, FISCAL YEARS 1963–73—Continued

[Thousands]

Program	Total	Fiscal year— 1972	1971	1970	1969	1968	1967	1966	1965	1964	1963
FIRST-TIME ENROLLMENTS[1]											
Total	8,116.9	1,973.0	1,412.5	1,051.4	1,080.7	700.0	853.3	658.7	394.8	77.6	34.1
Manpower Development and Training Act	2,087.0	301.0	254.0	221.0	226.0	241.0	265.0	235.0	158.9	77.6	34.1
Institutional training[2]	1,364.0	159.6	155.0	130.0	135.0	140.0	150.0	177.5	145.3	66.6	30.9
JOP-OJT[3]	723.2	141.0	99.2	91.0	85.0	101.0	115.0	58.3	11.6	9.0	2.1
Neighborhood Youth Corps	4,321.7	1,010.9	740.2	602.1	504.1	457.3	588.3	422.9	137.9		
In school	903.3	186.9	129.0	74.6	84.3	118.3	186.8	166.8	54.7		
Out of school	895.6	61.9	33.9	46.2	74.5	92.0	101.6	108.9	35.6		
Summer	2,650.9	758.9	567.2	361.5	345.3	259.2	227.9	99.2	47.6		
Operation Mainstream	180.7	31.4	21.9	12.5	11.3	12.6	11.0				
Public service careers[4]	125.9	44.9	47.3	3.6	3.8	4.3	1.0				
Special impact[5]	5.3				2.7	2.6					
Concentrated employment program	468.5	84.7	88.7	118.1	127.0	54.0					
JOBS (federally financed)	313.4	62.8	92.6	86.8	51.7						
Work incentive program	408.1	120.6	112.2	92.7	80.6						
Job Corps	141.4	45.0	49.8	42.6							
Public employment program	226.1	226.1									

FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS

Total	$9,469,646	$2,886,940	$1,405,466	$1,418,582	$1,029,730	$882,173	$795,990	$629,497	$434,347	$142,111	$86,870
Manpower Development and Training Act	2,788,881	424,563	339,752	336,980	272,616	296,410	298,247	339,040	286,986	142,111	86,870
Institutional training[2]	2,290,848	365,700	275,457	287,031	213,905	221,067	215,388	281,710	240,348	135,525	84,219
JOP-OJT[3]	497,883	60,845	64,295	49,549	58,111	74,571	82,859	57,930	37,157	6,586	881
Neighborhood Youth Corps	2,642,788	517,244	439,463	388,580	329,066	281,864	340,833	262,387	127,742		
In school	(3)	74,987	58,860	58,242	48,048	56,988	67,448	(3)	(3)		
Out of school	(3)	121,962	115,915	87,923	123,721	96,279	146,879	(3)	(3)		
Summer	(3)	[6]329,380	[6]253,398	[6]199,434	[6]147,927	[6]128,677	133,366	(3)	(3)		
Operation Mainstream	294,764	85,104	71,580	51,043	41,080	32,319	23,628				
Public service careers[4]	298,983	98,349	91,636	68,366	18,488	7,557	15,573				
Special impact[5]	10,138				1,165	2,038	7,009				
Concentrated employment program	838,988	164,698	166,752	107,982	114,229	93,037	79,411	25,425			
JOBS (federally financed)	711,896	118,224	160,661	146,020	109,021	89,529	34,250				
Work incentive program	427,476	174,780	84,885	76,789	100,817	9,000					
Job Corps	332,154	202,185	104,187	104,782							
Public employment program	987,879	987,879									

[1] Includes part-time and other training.

[2] Includes the JOBS-Optional program (JOP), which began in fiscal 1971, and the MDTA on-the-job training (OJT) program, which ended in fiscal 1970 except for national contracts. Also includes Construction Outreach.

[3] Includes enrollment opportunities made available by MDTA supplemental funds; these were 207,000 in fiscal 1972, 140,000 in fiscal 1971, 84,000 in fiscal 1970, 35,200 in fiscal 1969, and 48,200 in fiscal 1968.

[4] Includes the New Careers program.

[5] Transferred to the Office of Economic Opportunity effective July 1, 1969.

[6] Enrollment opportunities (slots) are not meaningful for CEP because the CEP approach utilizes a variety of program components—orientation, basic education, work experience, and other types of job training. An individual may be enrolled in one or in several components.

[7] The number of first-time enrollments per fiscal year is generally larger than the number of enrollment opportunities (slots) programmed, as a slot may be used by more than one individual during the year because of turnover or short-term training. If openings are unfilled, the number of first-time enrollments may be smaller than the number of enrollment opportunities.

[8] Data are not available for Neighborhood Youth Corps components prior to fiscal 1967.

[9] Includes obligations made available by MDTA supplemental funds; these were $1,30,730,500 in fiscal 1972, $63,200,000 in fiscal 1971, $36,387,000 in fiscal 1970, $7,440,000 in fiscal 1969, and $12,381,000 in fiscal 1968.

Source: 1973 manpower report of the President.

10

ESTIMATED RURAL ENROLLMENT IN SELECTED MANPOWER PROGRAMS AND FUNDS OBLIGATED FOR RURAL ENROLLEES, FISCAL YEAR 1972

	New enrollment, fiscal year 1972	Estimated rural enrollment		Estimated funds obligated [1]	
		Number	Percent	Total (millions)	For rural enrollees (millions)
Total	[2] 1,532,000	323,000	21.1	$1,463.1	$322.0
Institutional	109,000	25,200	19.4	355.7	69.0
National contracts (OIT)	24,000	6,500	26.2	19.3	5.1
Neighborhood Youth Corps:					
In-school	105,000	28,000	15.5	74.9	11.6
Out of school	45,000	20,000	21.4	122.9	26.3
Summer	759,000	174,000	23.0	329.4	75.7
Operation Mainstream	31,000	17,000	55.4	85.2	47.2
Concentrated employment program	94,700	14,000	22.2	154.6	34.3
JOBS	82,000	10,200	12.5	118.2	14.8
Work incentive program	130,000	14,300	11.0	174.0	35.0
Public service careers:					
Plan A	16,000	900	5.1	14.0	.8
Plan B	11,000	900	8.1	4.1	.3
Plan C	5,300	1,700	32.0	19.1	6.1

[1] Estimate derived by applying the percent of rural enrollment to total obligations.
[2] Total does not include Jobs Optional Program (JOP), Construction Outreach, PSC—Plans D, E, & E, NCES, PEP, and Job Corps for which urban/rural data is not available.

Source: Office of Financial Management Information Systems, OMA; Manpower Administration, Department of Labor, Jan. 5, 1973.

As can be seen in the preceding table, the enrollment of rural residents is by far the highest in the operation Mainstream program with over half of the enrollees residing in rural counties. On the other hand, rural residents constitute a rather low percentage of enrollments in the JOBS program, WIN, and plans A and B of the Public Service Careers program.

11

Following are some key characteristics of rural residents enrolled in selected manpower programs during Fiscal Year 1972.

KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF RURAL RESIDENTS ENROLLED IN SELECTED MANPOWER PROGRAMS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1972

[In percent]

	Operation Mainstream	Work incentive program	Concentrated employment program	Institutional [1]	
				Regular	Part time
Characteristic:					
Sex:					
Male	70	47	48	54	72
Female	30	53	52	46	28
Race:					
White	70	69	86	73	88
Negro/black	15	13	12	20	10
American Indian	12	3	1	5	1
Asian American	2	9	1	1	1
Other	1	7	30	1	1
Age:					
Under 19	2	12	14	14	4
19 to 21	2	17	27	25	8
22 to 44	34	66	52	51	57
45 to 54	26	4	4	6	23
55 and up	36	1	3	3	10
Spanish	3	4	6	3	1
Education:					
Under 8	26	11	11	6	6
8	13	13	11	7	11
9 to 11	28	37	28	29	33
12 and up	33	39	49	59	50
Military:					
Total vets	28	16	19	25	25
Disabvets	22	8	8	8	10
Disadvantaged:					
Yes	96	92	90	86	89
No	4	8	1	14	10
Poverty:					
Yes	97	96	99	87	95
No	3	4	1	13	5
Family head:					
Yes	85	35	65	57	75
No	15	65	35	43	25

[1] Less than ½ of 1 percent.

KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF RURAL RESIDENTS ENROLLED IN SELECTED MANPOWER PROGRAMS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1972

[In percent]

	On the job training	Neighborhood Youth Corps		New Careers
		Out of school	Phase II	
Characteristic:				
Sex:				
Male	78.0	35	48	35
Female	21.0	65	52	65
Race:				
White	78.0	64	63	58
Negro, black	17.6	25	33	40
American Indian	4.0	3	1	1
Asian American	.5	1	1	1
Other	.5	3	2	2
Age:				
Under 19	18.8	36	36	3
19 to 21	21.6	6	7	11
22 to 44	55.3	1	1	26
45 to 54	10.0	1	0	4
55 and up	4.0	1	1	5
Spanish:	1.0	1	1	11
Education:				
Under 8	7.0	11	10	1
8	6.0	23	12	3
9 to 11	29.0	64	76	23
12 and up	57.0	1	1	72
Military:				
Total vets	35.0	1	1	24
Nonvets	34.9	99	99	76
Disadvantaged:				
Yes	41.0	97	99	94
No	58.0	3	1	6
Poverty:				
Yes	41.0	98	99	95
No	58.0	2	1	5
Family head:				
Yes	67.0	32	32	49
No	33.0	68	67	49

[1] Less than ½ of 1 percent.

Brief Description of Manpower Training and Employment Programs Serving Rural America

(1) *MDTA On-the-Job and Institutional Training*

The expressed objectives of the MDTA are to alleviate the hardships of unemployment, to reduce the costs of unemployment compensation and public assistance, and to increase the Nation's productivity. OJT is authorized under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

On-the-job training (OJT) programs provide occupational training for unemployed and underemployed persons who cannot reasonably obtain appropriate full-time employment without MDTA assistance. Such training generally is conducted through private industry, in the regular work environment, by local employers; or by national groups, such as union organizations, or nonprofit organizations. The private firms are reimbursed by the Federal Government either directly or through the State for certain costs of instruction, materials, and other expenses related to training. The trainees are on the payrolls of the employers.

The institutional training program is also authorized under title II of the MDTA and provides occupational training in the classroom and related supportive services for unemployed persons 16 years of age and older who cannot reasonably be expected to obtain full-time employment with their present skills, and for underemployed persons who are working but who, with training, could obtain higher level employment.

Training relevant to the local labor market, as determined by the State employment service, usually is provided in skills centers or in public or private vocational schools. The training courses are developed and carried out jointly by the local employment service office and vocational education agency, in coordination with their Federal counterparts in the Department of Labor and HEW.

Of the funds for institutional training and on-the-job training programs, 80 percent is apportioned to the States using a formula which reflects the severity of unemployment in the States as well as other factors which are prescribed by the act.

(2) *Public Employment Program (PEP)*

The Emergency Employment Act of 1971, administered by the Department of Labor, seeks to alleviate high unemployment by authorizing $2.25 billion to State and local governments in a 2-year Public Employment Program to hire unemployed or underemployed persons for public service jobs. The jobs are to be transitional in nature, and the participants are to move to regular jobs as soon as practicable. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of carrying out the program. The remaining 10 percent must be contributed by the participating governmental units—Federal, State, and local governments; their subdivisions or institutions; and Indian tribes

on Federal or State reservations. Funds are used primarily to pay wages and employment benefits to the persons employed.

(3) *Neighborhood Youth Corps Program (NYC)*

The Neighborhood Youth Corps program provides opportunities to students of low-income families to earn sufficient funds to remain in school while receiving useful work experience and some supportive services; and provides work experience training and supportive services for youths from low-income families who have dropped out of school.

The program has three major components: (1) an in-school program which provides part-time work for students of high school age from low-income families, (2) a summer program which provides such students with job opportunities during the summer months, and (3) an out-of-school program which provides economically deprived school dropouts who are 16 to 17 years of age (10 percent may be enrolled at 18 and 19 years of age) with practical work experience and on-the-job training to encourage them to return to school and resume their education or, if this is not feasible, to help them acquire skills that will improve their employability.

Enrollees work an average of 26 hours a week during the summer and 8 to 15 hours a week during the school year and receive the appropriate Federal, State, or local minimum wage, whichever is higher. Projects are sponsored by State and local public nonprofit agencies, including public schools and Community Action Agencies. Administrative authority was delegated by OEO to the Department of Labor in October 1964.

(4) *JOBS Program*

The JOBS program is directed to persons who are classified as disadvantaged and who need on-the-job training and such supportive services as basic education and counseling to enable them to become productive workers. The program was founded on the premise that immediate placement in jobs at regular wages, followed by on-the-job training and supportive services, would provide superior motivation for disadvantaged persons. The Department of Labor, in cooperation with the National Alliance of Businessmen, provides technical assistance and encouragement to employers.

The program consists of a contract component and a noncontract, or voluntary, component. Under the contract component, private employers enter into contracts with the Department of Labor either individually or in groups—consortia—for the employment and training of disadvantaged persons. The contracts are intended to provide for the payment of the extraordinary costs in hiring, training, and retaining disadvantaged persons. Under the noncontract component, private employers pledge to hire specific numbers of disadvantaged persons without any cost to the Government. Noncontract employers are not subject to the same Government restrictions, controls, and reporting requirements as contract employers.

(5) *Work Incentive (WIN) Program*

The WIN program is designed to provide certain recipients of assistance under the AFDC and AFDC–UP programs with training opportunities and with such supportive services as are necessary to move them from welfare dependency to economic self-sufficiency through meaningful jobs. The WIN program is administered at the

Federal level jointly by the Department of Labor and HEW. In each State, the State employment service—under contract with the Department of Labor—is the prime manpower sponsor for the WIN program. State and local welfare agencies are responsible for referring AFDC recipients who qualify for the WIN program to nearby State employment service offices for enrollment in the program and for providing welfare supportive services.

(6) *Concentrated Employment Program (CEP)*

The Concentrated Employment Program is a system of packaging and delivering manpower services in a clearly defined geographical area. Working through a single contract with a single sponsor (usually a Community Action Agency), the Department of Labor provides a flexible package of manpower programs, including outreach and recruitment; orientation; counseling and job coaching; basic education; various medical, day-care, and other supportive services; work-experience or vocational training under a variety of manpower programs; job development and placement; and individualized follow-up after placement. Manpower employability and training services are provided only to disadvantaged residents of the locally defined CEP area. As of November 1972 there were 69 urban and 13 rural CEPs.

(7) *Job Corps*

The Job Corps is a national program designed to serve those disadvantaged young men and women aged 16 to 21; to train enrollees to become productive citizens; to place terminated corps members in jobs, other training programs, secondary schools or the Armed Forces; and to test, develop, and disseminate new techniques for working with disadvantaged youths that will improve the capability of the Job Corps and other institutions training disadvantaged youth.

The program has residential urban and rural conservation centers as well as nonresidential centers which serve as skill training centers, but permit the youths to remain in or near their home communities. Job Corps centers are run by State and Federal agencies, private industry, and public agencies or nonprofit agencies having the capabilities to carry out the objectives of the program. As of June 30, 1972 there were 74 centers—including 30 civilian conservation centers. Functions of the Job Corps were delegated by OEO to the Department of Labor in July 1969.

As of June 30, 1973, a total of 5,794 slots were available in the 30 Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers—twenty of the Civilian Conservation Centers are operated by the Forest Service (providing 3,904 slots) and 10 by the Department of Interior (providing 1,890 slots). The Civilian Conservation center vocational skills training and work experience projects are so designed that maximum consideration is given to developing public resources and recreational areas.

(8) *Job Bank Program*

The Job Bank Program provides, through the use of automatic data processing procedures and equipment, maximum exposure of job openings on a current basis to applicants seeking work in a public employment service office or in a participating agency office in a city where a job bank is operating. The program is run through the State

employment security agencies as part of their total program of employment services provided to individual applicants.

(9) Operation Mainstream

The stated purpose of Operation Mainstream is to provide permanent jobs, at decent wages, for poor adults with a history of chronic unemployment. Two important characteristics of the program are its focus on elderly workers and, in comparison to most other manpower programs, its high concentration in rural areas. Operation Mainstream is primarily a public service employment program which provides for the betterment and beautification of the communities where projects are located. It is not a completely homogeneous program, but consists rather of a collection of programs—including the Green Thumb, Green Light, and Senior Aides programs.

Operation Mainstream projects are directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed who have no reasonable alternative prospects for full-time employment. Applicants for Operation Mainstream projects must demonstrate that they have been unable to secure either appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs. In addition, participants must have an annual family income below the poverty line.

(10) Area Concept Expansion (ACE)

The Area Concept Expansion (ACE) project is an outgrowth of an experiment conducted in Ottumwa, Iowa in which an employment service office was established in the dominant city of a five-county region. This office was supplemented with satellite offices in other parts of the area. The project demonstrated that a full range of manpower services could be provided to a large area with a diverse and scattered population. By the end of 1972, the Department's Rural Manpower Service had ACE projects operational in 11 States. The experience gave indication that this approach could be used with success in large multicounty areas which are predominantly rural but are economically integrated with an economically viable core city.

(11) National Migrant Worker Programs

The Department of Labor has undertaken various projects and implemented a National Migrant Worker Program to assist migrant farmworkers in "settling-out" of the migrant stream.

A Migrant Experimental and Demonstration project was conducted during 1969 and 1970 to explore ways of providing migrant farmworkers with supportive services, as well as manpower services, and offering special help to those families who decide to settle out of the migratory stream. The rationale behind the project was that a successful job placement requires that the worker also be helped in solving various personal problems related to holding his job. Most migrants travel and work in family groups and the problems of all family members are therefore matters of concern.

The National Migrant Worker Program assists migrants and their families to settle out of the migrant stream. The migrant worker is to be given basic education, vocational training, and supportive services (including financial assistance) to help him develop marketable job skills that will enable him to secure stable, year-round employment, either in his home base area or in states along the migrant stream.

The program also includes staff training, research, and experimentation with bilingual skill training and basic education to find the best ways to help migrants. According to the Department of Labor, the program has helped 5,800 migrants and their families since July 1971 to voluntarily leave the migratory stream. As of June 30, 1972, funds were allocated for projects in 14 States.

The Department of Labor also implemented a program in early 1972 known as "The Last Yellow Bus" to assist the victims of mechanization, to end forced migration, and to provide meaningful options that will guarantee greater opportunities for migrant workers and their families. During FY 1972, $20.2 million was allocated for this program which consists of two major training strategies—(1) comprehensive training and job development programs in the home base area, and (2) settling out programs.

(12) Operation Hitchhike

In July 1971, the Department of Labor's Rural Manpower Service began testing a new approach to manpower service delivery. The new program, called Operation Hitchhike, is a technique for using the resources of institutions already functioning in remote rural areas. The aim is to bring manpower services to workers living beyond the range of easy access to regular employment service offices. Hitchhike is basically an experiment in adding manpower services to the on-going functions of those established rural institutions.

Under the Hitchhike concept, the Department of Labor enters into a contract with a State Employment Service which in turn subcontracts with some agency with appropriate facilities and staff in the selected rural area. Hitchhike contracts specify what each agency is to provide in the way of services. The subcontracting agency works with the job-ready applicant and provides such direct services as outreach, interviewing, application taking, job development, manpower information disbursement, placement, and referral to other manpower and supportive services. The Employment Service—which is the prime contractor—is responsible for providing intensive employability development for applicants who are not job ready.

The subcontractor also is responsible for services to employers, civic groups, and other agencies. These activities include dissemination of labor market information, campaigns relating to available manpower services, and calling attention to other sources of assistance.

(13) Concerted Services in Training and Education (CSTE)

Concerted Services in Training and Education is a pilot effort to improve smaller communities and rural areas by demonstrating that education and occupational training, in conjunction with other economic development activities, can significantly help to increase employment opportunities. It is a cooperative venture that places heavy emphasis on involvement of local leaders and cooperation with community organizations.

CSTE was organized by a 16-member task force, which in turn had been suggested by a Cabinet-level rural development committee. Its major function is to plan and coordinate pilot projects at the Federal level. The task force includes representatives of the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; Agriculture; Commerce; and

Interior; as well as the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The program has the following objectives:

—Develop general operational patterns for concentrating all of the available, emerging and necessary agencies and resources on the occupational education problems, and as necessary on the health, welfare, socio-economic, and related problems of those residing in the selected communities.

—Identify existing and potential employment opportunities and occupational education programs available to youth and to adults who are unemployed or whose income is insufficient to maintain a decent standard of living.

—Develop ways in which these rural communities can provide educational, guidance, and other services needed to help people become employable and secure employment. This would include development of plans for increasing basic educational programs, improving general conditions of health and correcting physical conditions, providing vocational counseling, and developing occupational competency.

—Demonstrate that occupational education effort, based on local involvement, will develop indigenous leadership, individual dignity, initiative, and community awareness resulting in continuing community development.

—Determine the relationship of the traditional educational and occupational patterns of people in the communities to their present and emerging needs and make recommendations for necessary adjustments.

(14) *Co-Op Support Program*

Operating under the premise that cooperatives provide the most viable means for increasing economic strength in many rural communities, the Department of Labor's Co-Op Support Program expands training programs for managerial staff, as well as members, of producer and consumer cooperatives. Also, pilot projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of the cooperative concept are being conducted. The program operated in 14 States at the end of fiscal year 1972.

(15) *Farm Foreman Training*

The Department of Labor has initiated a program in rural areas known as the Farm Foreman Training program. Under this program—presently operating in only one State—supervisors of agricultural workers are receiving labor relations instruction, with the objective of reducing labor turnover. This program—which provides a 20-hour course to enrollees—is being expanded to include more trainees in a number of States through the help of government agencies and private business.

(16) *The Smaller Communities Program*

The Smaller Communities Program began as a special project and was originally titled the Experimental Rural Area Program (ERAP). This experimental program was started in Fiscal Year 1959 in one rural area in each of four States—Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. In January 1962, the ERAP was redesignated the Smaller Communities Program and established as a permanent program. Its purpose was to help alleviate employment problems in rural

areas by delivering a full range of manpower services through the use of mobile teams to communities remote from local employment services offices.

The Smaller Communities Program acts as a catalyst between rural areas and industry. Its purposes are to (1) assess current and potential skills of manpower resources in the area, (2) cooperate with other agencies and community groups in developing a program for economic development, and (3) provide employment and training, counseling, and placement assistance to individuals for jobs within or outside the area.

(17) *Woods Program*

Because of the widespread shortage of workers in the woods industries, rural residents are receiving education and training to help them qualify for available jobs. The program gives technical assistance in setting up training institutions and developing both training—especially on-the-job training, or a combination of OJT and classroom instruction—and placement services.

(18) *Indian Program*

The Department of Labor along with other government agencies is trying to help insure that Indians living both on and off reservations receive full manpower services, as well as consideration in the planning process. The 1970 Census count of American Indians and Alaska Natives shows that about half of the total 827,108 Indians live in rural areas.

In this effort, emphasis is being placed on the upgrading of reservation Indians in agricultural or related jobs and training programs in rural industries. In addition, an effort is being made to increase interstate recruitment of these workers for both agricultural and nonagricultural jobs.

(19) *Agribusiness Occupational Identification Program*

An interdepartmental committee comprised of the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Labor, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare is engaged in the first nationwide study of agribusiness occupations. Data are being collected on all agribusiness occupations, using a broad definition of agribusiness. From this data, it should be possible to identify current and projected employment opportunities in these occupations, and the education and training needed for agribusiness and related jobs. It is anticipated that this information will be useful in revising school curriculums, developing training programs, and assisting counselors, career planners, and Federal and State manpower planners.

Bibliography

Berry, Dale W. and others. National evaluation of operation mainstream. Phase I. The green thumb-green light program. Final report for Phase I of III. Albuquerque, New Mexico, Kirschner Associates, January 1971. 235 p.

National evaluation of operation mainstream. Phase II: The senior aides program. Final report for Phase II of III. Albuquerque, New Mexico, Kirschner Associates, May 1971. 317 p.

National evaluation of operation mainstream. Phase III. Final Report for Part I of Phase III. Albquerque, New Mexico, Kirschner Associates, August 1971. 198 p.

National evaluation of operation mainstream. Phase III. Final Report for Part II of Phase III. Albuquerque, New Mexico, Kirschner Associates, October 1971. 198 p.

National evaluation of operation mainstream, a public service employment program. Phase IV: Comparative Analysis. Albuquerque, New Mexico, Kirschner Associates, December 1971. 222 p.

Borus, Michael E. *ed.* Evaluating the impact of manpower programs. Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath & Co., 1972. 271 p.

Cargill, B. F. and G. E. Rossmiller, *eds.* Fruit and vegetable harvest mechanization policy implications. East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State University, 1970. 43 p.

Concerted services. Annual report, 1970–71. Musselshell Valley Development Corporation, Roundup, Montana, 1971. 25 p.

Concerted services in training and education. Wash., D.C., Interdepartmental-Federal Task Force, November 13–17, 1972. 88 p.

Concerted services in training and education. Oct.–Dec. 1972. Progress Report. Wash., D.C., Interdepartmental Federal Task Force, Dec. 31, 1972. 73 p.

Employment in Appalachia: trends and prospects. Washington, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. Agriculture economic report no. 134, June 1968. 54 p.

An evaluation of results and effectiveness of job banks. v. 1. Newport Beach California, Ultrasystems Incorporated, 1971. 40 p.

Fairchild, Charles K. Worker relocation: a review of U.S. Dept. of Labor mobility demonstration projects. Final report of a study for the U.S. Dept. of Labor. Wash., D.C., April 27, 1970. 175 p.

Farm labor developments. Wash., D.C., U.S. Dept. of Labor, April/May, June/July; Nov./Dec. 1970.

Griessman, B. Eugene. Concerted services approach to developmental change in rural areas: an interim evaluation. Center research and development report no. 1. Raleigh, North Carolina, Center for Occupational Education, 1968. 139 p.

Hightower, Jim. Hard tomatoes, hard times, the failure of the land grant college complex. Wash., D.C., Agribusiness Accountability project, 1972. 308 p.

The Impact of five rural concentrated employment programs. Cambridge, Mass., Urban Systems Research & Engineering, Inc., March 31, 1971. 234 p.

Interstate conference of employment security agencies. Report of the second meeting. Wash., D.C., Rural Manpower Committee, July 18, 19, 20, 1972. 7 p.

Mangum, Garth L. MDTA. Foundation of federal manpower policy. Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press, 1968. 184 p.

McCalley, John S. Problems related to improving the organization of training in small towns and rural areas. Wash., D.C., U.S. Dept. of Labor, Rural Manpower Service, Nov. '9, 1971. 15 p.

Miles, Guy H. Guidelines for an experimental rural youth program for the North Central States, v. 1. Phase I final report on developing model NYC programs for rural youth. Minneapolis, Minn., North Star Research and Development Institute, 1971. 155 p.

A New life for the country. The report of the President's task force on rural development. Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., March 1970. 43 p.

New York (State). Dept. of Labor. Apprentice Training Section. Smaller communities, New York, 1973. 3 p.

New York (State) rural manpower service—1971 annual report. New York State Dept. of Labor, Manpower Services Division, August 1972. 50 p.

1971 Annual rural manpower report. State of Oregon, Employment Division, Dept. of Human Resources, 1971. 80 p.

North Carolina mobility project, 1965–1968, v. 1. The project population. North Carolina manpower development corporation, Durham, North Carolina, Sept. 30, 1968. 137 p.

Outreach training and family service methods developed by the M.I.T.C.E. experiment 1965–1968. North Carolina, North Carolina Fund, Dec. 31, 1967. 181 p.

Perry County manpower resources report. Little Rock, Arkansas, Arkansas Employment Security Division, Aug. 1972. 21 p.

Rural manpower developments. Wash., D.C., U.S. Dept. of Labor, Manpower Administration, March, May, Sept./Oct., 1971, March, June, Oct., 1972; Mar. 1973.

Ruttenberg, Stanley. Manpower challenge of the 1970's: institutions and social change. Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins Press, 1970. 126 p.

Seneca County manpower survey. Albany, New York, New York State Dept. of Labor. Smaller Communities Program, July 1972. 40 p.

Seneca industrial park area. Manpower survey. Albany, New York, New York State Dept. of Labor, Aug. 1971. 4 p.

Smaller communities program. Albany, New York, New York State Department of Labor, Aug. 1971. 4 p.

Smaller communities—RMS operation summary, Chicot county, Arkansas, and follow-up of previously surveyed counties. Little Rock, Arkansas, Employment security division, Arkansas smaller communities-rural manpower service, Jan. 1973. 9 p.

Smith, J. Vernon and others. Concerted services in Arkansas: an evaluation of developmental change. Center research and development report No. 6. Raleigh, North Carolina, Center for Occupational Education, 1969. 92 p.

Taylor, Lee. Urban-rural problems. Belmont, California, Dickenson Pub. Co., 1968. 113 p.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Guide to Federal programs for rural development. Wash., D.C., Govt. Print. Off., Dec. 17, 1971. 576 p. (92nd Congress, 1st session. Senate. Doc. no. 92–54).

Progress and plans for implementation of rural development act of 1972. Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., Apr. 11, 1973. 205 p.

At head of title: Committee Print.

"The people left behind"—four years later. Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1971. 78 p.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Case studies of the Emergency Employment Act in operation. Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., Sept. 1973. 1410 p.

Farmworkers in rural America, 1971–72. Hearings before the Subcommittee on migratory labor, part 4 A, Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., June 19, 1972.

U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. Rural development chartbook. Wash., D.C., 1972. 44 p.

U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. Community Services Administration. Door to opportunity; title V, Economic Opportunity Act. Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1970. 64 p.

U.S. Dept. of Labor, Manpower Administration. The impact of five rural concentrated employment programs. Cambridge, Mass., Urban Systems Research and Engineering, Inc., March 31, 1971. 233 p.

Final report on developing model NYC programs for rural youth. Minneapolis, Minn., North Star Research and Development Institute, May 27, 1971. 47 p.

A rural manpower strategy. Wash., D.C., June 1971. 94 p.

Review of the rural manpower service. Wash., D.C., 1972. 152 p.

U.S. General Accounting Office. The effects of federal expenditures on the economy of Johnson County, Kentucky; Report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Wash., D.C., 1972. 79 p. (B-130515, Feb. 7, 1972)

Public employment programs in selected rural and urban areas; Report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Wash., D.C., 1973. 47 p. (B-163922, Aug. 1, 1973)

Federal manpower training programs—GAO conclusions and observations; Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Wash., D.C., 1972. 38 p. (B-146879, Feb. 17, 1972)

Need to enhance the effectiveness of on-the-job training in Appalachian Tennessee; Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Wash., D.C., 1970. 53 p. (B-146879, Nov. 13, 1970)

Impact of grants to Indian tribes under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971; Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Wash., D.C., 1973. 41 p. (B163922, Mar. 14, 1973)

Problems in making the concentrated employment program work in rural Mississippi; Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Wash., D.C., 1972. 43 p. (B130515, Mar. 15, 1972)

Public service benefits from jobs under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971; Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Wash., D.C., 1973. 16 p. (B163922, June 8, 1973)

U.S. General Accounting Office. Types of jobs offered to unemployed persons under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971; Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. Wash., D.C., 1972. 19 p. (B-163922, Nov. 27, 1972)

U.S. President. Manpower report of the President. Wash., D.C., U.S. Govt. Print. Off., Mar. 1973, 253 p.

O